

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

---

RHONDA HALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 3:05-cv-30002-MAP

VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,  
and VERIZON NEW ENGLAND, INC.

Defendants.

---

**MOTION OF PLAINTIFF RHONDA HALL FOR AN  
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE OPPOSITION TO FILE  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION *IN LIMINE***

The plaintiff respectfully moves this Court for an extension of time until Friday, May 18, 2007 to file her opposition to the defendants' motion *in limine*. As grounds for this motion, plaintiff states as follows:

1. The defendants have filed three separate motions. The first is a motion to disqualify plaintiff's counsel on the grounds that he is a necessary witness in this case. The second is a motion to submit to the court any federal claim for back pay. The scheduling of these two motions was the subject of an order of the court on April 5, 2007 following the Final Pretrial Conference in this matter.

2. The third motion filed by the defendants is a Motion *in Limine* to exclude Evidence of Carew Street Graffiti. Under the Court's original scheduling order, Motions *in Limine* were not due until a week before the trial in this matter.

The trial is presently scheduled to begin on July 1, 2007, and plaintiff's counsel was not anticipating having to respond to a motion *in limine* at this early date.

3. The plaintiff has completed and filed her opposition to the first two of the defendants' motions. The effort required to conduct necessary research into the issues raised by the disqualification motion, in particular, and complete the plaintiff's opposition and supporting documentation was more time-consuming than Plaintiff's counsel had originally anticipated.

4. Prior to May 3, 2007, plaintiff's counsel had been actively preparing for a two week trial in this court which was scheduled to proceed on Tuesday, May 8, 2007, and was continued to a date in June. Other pressing scheduling demands and unanticipated family obligations over the past week have further interfered with plaintiff's counsel's ability to complete the plaintiff's opposition to the defendants' motion *in limine*.

5. Insofar as the trial in this matter is more than a month away, the extension sought in this motion would not be disruptive of the court's ability to rule on this or other evidentiary issues.

Respectfully submitted,  
PLAINTIFF RHONDA HALL  
By her Attorney,

Dated: May 14, 2007

/s/ Hugh D. Heisler

Hugh D. Heisler  
BBO # 563925  
Heisler, Feldman, McCormick &  
Garrow, P.C.  
1145 Main Street, Suite 508  
Springfield, MA 01103  
(413) 788-7988

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Hugh D. Heisler, hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing Motion was served electronically upon the attorney of record for the Defendants on May 14, 2007.

/s/ Hugh D. Heisler  
Hugh D. Heisler